REMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY AND STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 are pending.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Karger (US Patent No. 6,430,618).

Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karger in view of Colyer (US Patent No. 6,023,722).

Dependent claims 3 and 6 are amended into independent form incorporating the features of independent claims 1 and 4, respectively. Claims 1 and 4 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice.

Thus, claims 3 and 6 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been introduced in this Amendment. The foregoing rejections are hereby traversed.

35 USC 102(e) AND 103 REJECTIONS

PRIOR ART

KARGER & COLYER

The claimed present invention relates to management of processing requests by the same client/user, as recited in the original independent claims 1 and 4. The present invention's only commonality with Karger is to reduce network traffic overload. However, Karger and the present claimed invention achieve such network traffic reduction differently, because Karger relates to distributing information requests to servers (column 1, lines 15-18). To be concrete, in Karger, an information request is mapped to a location in a mathematical mapping space (column 6, lines 22-34; and column 9, lines 18-20). Karger in column 2, lines 8-22, discloses that frequently requested documents are copied from the original server to a cache server, and client requests are forwarded through the cache server. More specifically, the Karger system comprises the original sites, the cache servers, and the clients as shown in Figs. 1A and 1B, and Karger provides a consistent hashing so that for most of the set of information requests, the cache server allocation is consistent even as resources (servers) are added and removed

5

(column 6, lines 22-34). Therefore, Karger relates to distributing information requests to servers (column 1, lines 15-18) but fails to disclose or suggest the present invention's management of processing requests by the same client/user as recited in the original independent claims 1 and 4 of the present invention. Therefore, as stated in the previous Amendment, Karger fails to disclose or suggest the original independent claims 1 and 4 of the present invention.

Nevertheless dependent claims 3 and 6 are amended for clarity and into independent form by incorporating the features of original independent claims 1 and 4, respectively, to place the application in condition for allowance. First, new independent claims 3 and 6 are amended to recite "a first client" to clarify that the processing requests are from the same client/user. Second, regarding dependent claims 4 and 6 (now amended into independent form), the Examiner admits on page 5 of the Office Action that Karger fails to disclose a prohibiting unit of the claimed invention. The Examiner relies on Colyer to reject dependent claim 3 and 6 (now amended into independent form) by asserting that the "prohibiting unit" of dependent claim 3 and 6 are well known. In particular, the Examiner asserts, "Colyer discloses a system for allowing clients to request information from servers, and Colyer further discloses that "in prior architectures, it was necessary to wait until a received request was served by a server and a reply sent back through the opened connection before another connection could be accepted to receive the next request from the Internet," column 7, lines 35-39. However, the Examiner's well known assertion is traversed, because Colyer, column 7, lines 34-38 disclose that in the prior architectures requests were processed step by step by the server, whereas the present invention provides "a prohibiting unit which prohibits ~~the~~an operation of said request reading unit after one of said at least one processing request from the first client stored in said request storing unit is read out, until a processing result corresponding to said one of said at least one processing request from the first client is transmitted to ~~a~~the first client." A benefit of the claimed invention is to prevent double processing request registration by the same client/user.

Therefore, in contrast to Karger, the present invention reduces a load imposed on a server by not processing duplicate/identical processing client requests. More particularly, the present invention as recited in claim 3 provides a server comprising,

> a receiving unit which receives the at least one processing request from a first client;
>
> a request storing unit which stores the at least one processing request received from at least one client,the first client;
>
> a request reading unit which reads out one of said at least one processing request from the first client stored in said request storing unit, andunit;
>
> a determination unit which determines whether another processing request which is identical to the processing request received from the first client, has already been processed;
>
> an execution unit which executes processing of the request received from *the first client,* and stores a result of the processing in said result storing unit when said determination unit determines that no other processing request *which is identical to the processing request received from the first client has been processed;*
>
> ... (emphasis added)

See page 3, lines 3-12 of the present Application. The claimed invention differs from Karger's cache servers, because Karger relates to information requests and does not relate to the present invention's managing duplicate/identical requests for processing by the same client/user. Further, Karger does not disclose, suggest, or provide any motivation to provide the present invention's,

> a prohibiting unit which *prohibits* thean operation of said request reading unit *after one of said at least one processing request from the first client* stored in said request storing unit is read out, *until* a processing result corresponding to said one of said at least one *processing request from the first client is transmitted to* athe first *client* " (emphasis added)

Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine Karger with Colyer, because Karger does not relate to the claimed invention, and even if combined, Colyer does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, the claim amendments are not narrowing amendments for overcoming Karger and Colyer. And the invention set forth in independent claims 3 and 6 are not obvious in view of the combination of Karger and Colyer.

Support for the claims can be found, for example, in page 9, line 18 to page 10, line 8; and page 21, line 3 to page 23, line 24 of the present Application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and the remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 6, and allowance of claims 3 and 6 is respectfully requested.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _2/5/2004_   By: _____

Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501